

(Additional counsel on following page)

JESSICA R. PERRY (SBN 209321)

jperry@orrick.com

MELINDA S. RIECHERT (SBN 65504)

mrieichert@orrick.com

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

1000 Marsh Road

Menlo Park, CA 94025-1015

Telephone: +1 650 614 7400

Facsimile: +1 650 614 7401

KATHRYN G. MANTOAN (SBN 239649)

kmantoan@orrick.com

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

The Orrick Building

405 Howard Street

San Francisco, CA 94105-2669

Telephone: +1 415 773 5700

Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

Attorneys for Defendant

Apple Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ASHLEY GJOVIK,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 23-cv-4597-EMC

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S MOTION
TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S THIRD
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Dept: Courtroom 5, 17th Floor
Judge: Honorable Edward M. Chen
Date: May 16, 2024
Time: 1:30 p.m.

1 KATE E. JUVINALL (SBN 315659)
2 kjuvinall@orrick.com
3 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
4 631 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2-C
5 Santa Monica, CA 90401
6 Telephone: +1 310 633 2800
7 Facsimile: +1 310 633 2849

8 RYAN D. BOOMS (SBN 329430)
9 rbooms@orrick.com
10 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
11 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
12 Washington, D.C. 20037
13 Telephone: +1 202 339 8400
14 Facsimile: +1 202 339 8500

15 Attorneys for Defendant
16 Apple Inc.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Pending before the Court is Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Third
2 Amended Complaint. Having considered the relevant papers and pleadings on file with the Court
3 in this matter, as well as the arguments of counsel, the Court determines:

- 4 1. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's First Claim under RICO. Plaintiff fails
5 to state a claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a) because she fails to plead that Apple used or
6 invested money it received from supposed racketeering to injure her, and she fails to state
7 a claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c) and (d) because she fails to allege the existence of an
8 "enterprise" separate and distinct from Apple or a pattern of racketeering activity.
- 9 2. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Second Claim under the Sarbanes-
10 Oxley Act ("SOX") because Plaintiff fails to allege facts that, if true, would demonstrate
11 that she complained about conduct that she reasonably believed violated a provision
12 enumerated in 18 U.S.C. § 1514A(a)(1).
- 13 3. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Third Claim under the Dodd-Frank
14 Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act because it is derivative of her Second
15 Claim, and thus fails for the same reasons her SOX claim fails.
- 16 4. The Court **DISMISSES in part, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Fourth Claim alleging
17 nuisance/nuisance *per se* because Plaintiff does not have a property interest in the Apple
18 building she worked in (identified in the TAC as "825 Stewart Dr." or the "Superfund Site"),
19 and has not identified a law that declares it a nuisance to operate a manufacturing facility
20 (identified in the TAC as "3250 Scott Blvd" or "ARIA") or lease an office on a Superfund
21 site.
- 22 5. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Fifth Claim asserting strict liability for
23 ultrahazardous activities because it is time-barred, and because neither leasing office space
24 on a Superfund site nor operating a silicon manufacturing facility is an ultrahazardous
25 activity.
- 26 6. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Sixth Claim under the Bane Civil
27 Rights Act because Plaintiff fails to allege facts showing Apple interfered with Plaintiff's
28 constitutional or statutory rights, or that such interference included actual or attempted

threats, intimidation, or coercion.

7. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Seventh Claim under the Ralph Civil Rights Act because Plaintiff does not allege facts suggesting any threat of violence by Apple, or that any conduct by Apple was based on her political affiliation or other protected characteristic.

8. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Eighth Claim under California Labor Code section 1102.5 because Plaintiff fails to allege any facts that would establish a violation of the underlying statutes she identifies as a predicate for this claim.

9. The Court **DISMISSES in part, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Ninth Claim under California Labor Code section 98.6 to the extent it is predicated on an alleged violation of California Labor Code section 96(k) because Plaintiff fails to allege she was terminated for asserting a recognized constitutional right.

10. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Twelfth Claim asserting breach of contract and breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing because Plaintiff was an at-will employee.

11. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Thirteenth Claim asserting intentional infliction of emotional distress because it does not comply with FRCP 8(a). It should further be dismissed because it is based on non-actionable conduct, it is preempted by California's Workers Compensation exclusivity, and it is time-barred

12. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Fourteenth Claim asserting negligent infliction of emotional distress both because Plaintiff cannot allege that Defendants owed her the requisite duty, and because it is preempted by California's Workers Compensation exclusivity.

13. The Court **DISMISSES, with prejudice**, Plaintiff's Fifteenth Claim under California's Unfair Competition Law because Plaintiff does not allege any basis for restitution and thus lacks standing.

Accordingly, Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**, and Plaintiff's first, second, third, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth claims

1 are **DISMISSED with prejudice**, and Plaintiff's fourth and ninth claims are **DISMISSED in part**
2 **with prejudice**, as set forth above.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

5
6 Dated: _____

HON. EDWARD M. CHEN
U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE